

# **SOVIET PERSECUTION OF JEWS AND OTHER PERSONS**

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today—the day after the U.S. Senate gave its advice and consent to the limited nuclear test ban treaty—the world looks with renewed strength and spirit toward the prospect of peace.

It looks with renewed strength and spirit toward the day when all men will enjoy the basic freedoms.

Yet even today, as we look and work toward this goal, freedom of religion is trampled by one of the principal parties to a treaty that has given new hope to the world.

In the Soviet Union the free exercise of religion in any meaningful sense has been denied to everyone. All religions exist precariously, to say the least, in an officially antireligious atmosphere. But in a variety of fundamental ways, Judaism is subject to unique discrimination. Today the chief victims of religious persecution are the Jews.

The proposed execution of a Jewish rabbi for an alleged economic crime is only the latest in a long series of acts that provide us with tragic and abundant evidence of outright persecution.

Soviet law makes anti-Semitism a crime in Russia. Yet in Russia the Jew is branded as a Jew. On his domestic passport is stamped the word "Jewish" that identifies his nationality.

But while he has a nationality and secondarily, in Russia a religion, he has none of the rights of other nationalities and cultural groups. His ways of worship are severely limited. His synagogues are shut down, he is denied burial in the consecrated ground of Jewish cemeteries.

Other religious groups are allowed publishing facilities, central governing bodies, and religious objects. But the Jew has no religious articles—like the prayer shawl or phylacteries. He is permitted no publication facilities and no publications. No Hebrew Bible has been published for Jews since 1917. The study of Hebrew has been outlawed, even for religious purposes. He has no central organization or nationwide federation as do other major faiths. So he has no voice or way of bolstering and serving his faith.

There is one synagogue and one rabbi in the Soviet Union for each 15,000 or 16,000 Jewish believers. And though one yeshiva—or rabbinical academy—was established in 1957, it has been transformed by restrictions into an empty shell. This year there were only four students left. Obviously, there will be no way of replacing the rabbis now serving Jews in Russia—and most of them are in their seventies or eighties.

There are 3 million Russian Jews. And if they are not being slaughtered in mass pogroms, as they once were in Russia, and as they were in the ovens of the Nazi concentration camps, they are being slowly strangled. They are enjoying none of the gradually increasing freedoms of the Soviet society.

Chairman Khrushchev has labeled reports of anti-Jewish persecution as "a profound delusion." But is it a delusion when in the last 2 years at least 83 Jews

have been executed out of a total of 140 people condemned for alleged economic offenses? Is it a delusion when reputable reporters tell us of arrests, trials, and executions—of mass trials in many cities that have been markedly anti-Jewish? Is it a delusion when kosher butcher shops are closed and elderly Jews are put in prison for baking matzoth or unleavened bread in their own homes and selling it for the Passover holidays?

To put an end to the special qualities of the Jew—to stymie him if he seeks expression of his religious faith—to bully him and harass him until he gives up the religious heritage of the centuries—these are the ends officially sought by the Government of the Soviet Union.

The facts are most clearly stated in a scholarly article by Moshe Decter published in the distinguished quarterly review *Foreign Affairs* this past January, which I shall ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the *Record* at the conclusion of my remarks. The Jews are the only nationality deprived of the basic cultural rights accorded to all others in the U.S.S.R.

The Jew has no Jewish books or periodical. He has no theater, though the Yiddish theater was once considered a matter of Soviet pride. He is villified in the rigidly controlled Soviet press; anti-Jewish sentiments and stereotypes are built up, especially in the provincial press.

Most importantly, perhaps, he is cut off from the outside world. He has been warned: "Beware of foreigners." And of course, he cannot emigrate—cannot leave to seek his freedom elsewhere.

It is time that the free peoples of the world expressed their conscience about the persecution of the Jews in the Soviet Union. It is time we in the Senate speak up—on behalf of the free peoples of the United States.

The world has learned from bitter experience of the dangers of persecution of the Jews. We have learned that it is a symptom of a greater sickness. A symptom, though it hurts the sufferer, is not felt by others until the sickness spreads.

Let us try to curb this sickness before it spreads. Let us join together to demand that the Soviet Union curb her persecution of the Jews.

Let us say to her:

If the world is to have new hope, if the cold war is to ease, let the first thaw occur in the icy indifference you have shown to the plaintive cries of those within your borders who seek an end to religious persecution.

Mr. President, I therefore submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Soviet persecution of Jews and all other persons be condemned. I submit this resolution for Senators ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BAYH, BEALL, BOGGS, BREWSTER, BURDICK, CANNON, CASE, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, DODD, DOMINICK, DOUGLAS, EDMONDSON, GOLDWATER, GRUENING, HART, HARTKE, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, INOUE, JACKSON, JAVITS, JORDAN of Idaho, KEATING, KENNEDY, KUCHEL, LAUSCHE, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, MCNAMARA, METCALF, MONRONEY, MORSE,

MORTON, MOSS, MUNDT, NELSON, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PELL, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SIMPSON, SMATHERS, SYMINGTON, THURMOND, TOWER, WALTERS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio, and myself. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the *Record*, that it remain on the table for 10 days, and that there be printed in the *Record*, at this point an article from the January, 1963, issue of *Foreign Affairs*, entitled "The Status of the Jews in the Soviet Union" by Moshe Decter and an article from the June 16, 1962, issue of the *Saturday Evening Post*, entitled "The Kremlin's Persecution of Jews" by Rowland Evans, Jr.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the table, as requested, and be printed in the *Record*, along with the articles mentioned.

The resolution (S. Res. 204) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Senate of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by singling them out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religious leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is genuine hope for a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate, That it is the sense of the Senate that persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and fully permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.*

The articles presented by Mr. RIBICOFF are as follows:

[From *Foreign Affairs* magazine, January 1963]

## **THE STATUS OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION** (By Moshe Decter)

During the past quarter-century, enlightened public opinion throughout the world has become keenly sensitive to the treatment of minorities as a barometer of moral decency and social sanity. The awesome experiences of this period have drawn particular attention to the symbolic and actual position of the Jewish minority. In this light, the status of the Jews in the Soviet Union warrants special concern.

The situation of Soviet Jews can be comprehended primarily within the framework of Soviet nationalities policy. That policy, as reflected in Communist Party directives, the Soviet Constitution, and public law, is based on the ideological acceptance of the concept of national self-determination and on the legal recognition of the right of all nationalities within Soviet borders to cultural free-

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17

Then, too, the rehabilitative services provided for in the welfare amendments, if they are to have value in the lives of needy people, must be provided to them on a group or categorical basis.

The problems, the needs, the difficulties of blind people are different from those of elderly people; and the needs, problems, and difficulties of the totally and permanently disabled are different and distinct from the other two adult aided groups.

Rehabilitative services for each group must be designed and administered with this fact in mind.

Rehabilitative services are intended to help disabled people help themselves—to help them reconstruct shattered lives. Such services will only serve this fine purpose when they are oriented and directed to meet group needs, are directed toward group problems—problems which are shared by the blind—but not by the aged or the disabled; problems which are held in common by the elderly, or which are unique to the disabled and unknown to the blind and the aged.

Therefore, I am proposing that "services" in public welfare be categorically provided.

Section 10 would provide for an increase in the matching of State funds by the Federal Government whereby the Federal Government would pay six-sevenths—\$42.85—of the first \$50 of the average payment of aid to the blind, and from 50 percent to 75 percent—in accordance with the variable grant formula—of the difference between \$50 and \$100.

Mr. President, according to the March issue of HEW's publication, the Social Security Bulletin, the average amount of cash aid received by nearly 100,000 needy blind persons last November was \$70.84.

Although the average money payment was higher than this figure in some States, it was substantially lower in many States.

As you know, Mr. President, the recipient of aid to the blind cannot buy his food and clothing in special stores having special prices—prices geared to his very low monthly aid grant.

Nor are repairs or utility costs lower because a blind person is in need and must live on public assistance.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. President, that the barest minimum standards of decency and health cannot be maintained on the monthly grants of aid received by the blind in many of our States.

A change in the amount of the Federal share in blind-aid payments is very much needed, an increase in the Federal financial contribution in such payments is urgently necessary.

I am, therefore, proposing such a change, that the level of aid income to the needy blind may be raised, allowing these people the chance to live—not luxuriously, but with a greater degree of adequacy.

Section 11 would provide that any increase in Federal funds, made available by Congress to raise the amounts of the aid grants of needy blind persons be given to the States only upon the condition

that the States will pass on the additional funds to the aid recipients without diminishing the State or local government's share in such public assistance payments.

When the public welfare bill, H.R. 10606, was being considered in executive sessions of the Finance Committee, I offered an amendment requiring that the additional Federal money—\$5 per month per recipient—provided for in the bill to increase the aid grants of needy blind persons, be passed on to the recipients by the States, without a lessening of the State's share in such payments.

The committee and I were assured by HEW officials that this pass-on requirement was unnecessary—that the States would surely pass on the increase to their needy citizens.

Since the passage of the welfare measure, the record shows that few States have carried out the very specific direction of Congress—contained in the House and Senate committee reports—that the additional Federal share in aid payments was intended to go to the recipients, was intended to increase by \$5 the monthly aid allowances of needy people, and should be passed on by the States to them.

Nor is this the first time that the wish, intention, and direction of Congress has been disregarded in the matter of the States passing on increased Federal aid funds to recipients of public assistance.

Too often this has occurred over the years—the States have used money intended by Congress to increase payments to the needy for other purposes, or have passed on the additional Federal money only to reduce by the same amount their own contribution to such payments.

The proposal I am offering would make sure that Federal money in the federally supported State aid-to-the-blind programs is actually given to the needy, is actually received by them in their monthly aid grants.

Section 12 would prohibit the imposition of any residence requirement as a condition for receiving aid-to-the-blind payments.

I believe that blind persons on the aid rolls who possess the ability to earn their own living should not only be encouraged to do so, they should be helped to do so by every means possible.

Laws which hinder or block the efforts of these people to reach the goal of economic independence, I believe, should be either repealed or prohibited. Such laws are State residence laws which require that a blind person must live a specified period of time in a State in order to qualify for aid-to-the-blind payments.

Needing the whole Nation, the whole range of economic activities throughout the Nation available to him—that he may find his place, may find work commensurate with his training and skills—a blind person even though he is a public assistance recipient, and because he is a public assistance recipient, must be free to search for employment anywhere in the country, and he will be helped in his searching by being able to obtain public assistance in the new State where

he is seeking work until a job is finally found, until earnings start coming in.

State residence laws prevent such freedom of movement. They deny to the blind aid recipient the opportunity to go where he believes work can be found and secured. Such laws condemn him to a static existence in a State where his kind of work is just not available.

In conclusion, Mr. President, it is essential that each of the proposals contained in my blind-aid amending bill be adopted by Congress if the many capable, employable blind people on relief are to be helped to achieve rehabilitation, if they are to gain release from a lifetime of economic and social captivity.

Each of my proposals is designed to remove from the public assistance programs for the blind the punitive aspects of such programs, they are designed to make of these programs a bridge to rehabilitation, a means and a way of achieving, ultimately, self-support for thousands of sightless men and women.

I urge the acceptance of all of my proposals to improve public aid for the blind that the public aid provided may offer more than subsistence and survival; rather, that such public aid may offer adequate income with dignity, public support without penalties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 2181) to amend titles X and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve the programs of aid to the blind so that they will more effectively encourage and assist blind individuals to achieve rehabilitation and restoration to a normal, full, and fruitful life, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to commend the able Senator from Indiana for the introduction of this bill and the delivery of the message in conjunction with it. It has been my privilege to serve with the Senator from Indiana on the Finance Committee, the taxation committee of the Senate, for many years. I must state that throughout that period of time he has been most diligent in his efforts not only to protect but to improve the rights and privileges of the aged and the halt, and the blind particularly. I hope he will get the recognition which he so richly deserves for this vigilance, which he maintains continually. I wish to commend him for his efforts along this line. If there is any way the junior Senator from Florida can be of assistance to him in this most worthy project, I shall be most pleased to do so.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Florida. I will say that serving on the Finance Committee I have had a most able, qualified, and considerate tutor in the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is very generous, far beyond what I deserve.